PRESENT:—*cont.*

Ramachandra Reddi, Mr. B.
Ramanath Goenka, Mr.
Ramasomayajulu, Mr. C.
Ramjee Rao, Mr. V.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. U.
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C. S.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Saldanha, Mr. J. A
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Seturatnam Ayyar, Mr. M. R.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Sitarama Reddi, Rao Bahadur K.
Siva Raj, Mr. N.
Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
Slater, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, Mr. J. Mackenzie.
Soundara Pandia Nadar, Mr. W. P. A.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. R.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.
Srinivasan, Rao Sahib R.
Subrahmanya Moopanar, Mr. S.
Subrahmanya Pillai, Mr. Chavadi K.
Swami, Mr. K. V. R.
Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur, Nattam Dubash Kadir Sahib.
Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Syed.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Tulasiram, Mr. L. K.
Uppi Sahib Bahadur, K.
Vanavudaiya Gounder, Mr. S. V.
Venkatarama Sastri, C.I.E., Mr. T. R.
Venkataramana Ayyangar, Mr. C. V.
Venkatarangam Nayudu, Mr. C.
Venkayya, Mr. S.
Wood, Mr. C. E.
Zamindar of Gollapalli (Srimannarayana Appa Rao Bahadur Garu, Meka).
Zamindar of Mirzapuram (Mirzapuram Raja Garu alias Venkataramayya Appa Rao Bahadur Garu).
Zamindar of Seithur (Vadamalai Tiruvanatha Sevuga Pandiya Tevar Avargal).
Hawley, Mr. Herbert, M.S.C., F.I.C.
Russell, Major Alexander James Hutchinson, C.B.E., I.M.S.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

[*Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No.* 15.

1. Starred questions to be put at a meeting of the Council with their answers shall be printed and placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

The President will call out the name of each interpellator in the order in which the names are printed, specify the serial number of his question and make a sufficient pause to give him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place and putting a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.

2. If a member responsible for a starred question happens to be absent when it is called, it will be open either to him or to any other member to put supplemental questions thereon after the other starred questions for the day have been answered, provided question-time is not thereby exceeded.

3. Questions, not starred, will not be called in Council, but they will be printed with their answers and placed on the table of the House along with the list of starred questions. Oral supplementary questions will not be allowed in regard to unstarred questions.]

STARRED QUESTIONS

Land Revenue

Preference to ex-military men in assignment of lands.

*510 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Government gave a 'pledge' that special facilities in the way of obtaining land would be given to those who have undergone military service, either as combatants or non-combatants or as clerks during the Great War; if so, whether steps were taken to redeem such a 'pledge' in respect of non-combatants; and if not, why not;

[18th October 1927

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the first G.O. No. 870, Revenue, dated 14th April 1921, granting special facilities to ex-service non-combatants in obtaining lands within a time-limit of three years, was not published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*; and if so, why it was not so published;

(*c*) whether the Government are aware that owing to want of sufficient publicity of the said Government Order, many qualified ex-service non-combatants as described in G.O. No. 420, Public, dated 19th May 1923, were not able to avail themselves of such facilities within the time-limit;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that non-combatants got the very same medals and the same punishments as were given to combatants, and if so, why concessions for good service were restricted only to combatants;

(*e*) why Government made a distinction between combatants and non-combatants in G.O. No. 1576, Revenue, dated 10th October 1924, while extending the concessions granted in G.O. No. 870, Revenue, dated 14th April 1921, for a further period of three years; and

(*f*) whether the Government will be pleased to issue a fresh Government Order cancelling the last sentence of the first paragraph in G.O. No. 1576, Revenue, dated 10th October 1924, and extend the concessions in regard to assignments of lands to ex-military men irrespective of whether they are combatants or non-combatants for a further period of one year?

A.—(*a*) Yes. In G.O. No. 870, Revenue, dated 14th April 1921, the Government issued orders authorizing Collectors to accord preferential treatment in darkhast cases to non-combatants as well as to combatants.

(*b*), (*c*), (*d*), (*e*) & (*f*) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answers given to clauses (*b*), (*c*), (*e*) and (*f*) of the answer given to Legislative Council question No. 485 which was answered on 23rd March 1927.

Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed:—"May I know, Sir, why G.O. No. 870 was not made available to the public?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks:—"There was no intention to keep it from the public. The method which the Government thought best calculated to make it reach those to whom it was intended was adopted and there was no idea of in any way suppressing it."

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar:—"Then, why not publish it now?"

The hon Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks:—"Certainly, if it has not been published already."

Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed:—"May I know whether the District Collectors at least gave public notice of this order?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks:—"I cannot say that without notice."

Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed:—"May I know, Sir, why any such distinction is made between the officers of the Indian Army and non-combatants, as is stated in the answer to question No. 485?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks:—"What distinction? I do not understand, Sir."

18th October 1927]

Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed :—" In the answer to question No. 485 it is stated that the ex-service men were not debarred but a restriction was imposed and that that restriction applied only to members of the Indian Army. While the pledge was given to both the combatants and non-combatants, the restriction is made to apply only to men of the Indian Army. I wish to know why."

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks :—" I am sorry that I have not got the papers with me and must ask for notice. But if the hon. Member refers to why non-combatants were excluded, that was done, I think, after the concession had been in force for three years."

Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed :—" May I read, Sir, the statement in answer to question No. 485? 'The subsequent order . . . did not debar ex-service men from getting the concession relating to the grant of the land but only restricted the concession to those officers and men of the Indian Army who were recruited before the Armistice to the combatant ranks of the Army.' I wish to know, Sir, why this distinction was made between the officers and men of the Indian Army and the non-combatants and whether any such distinction was sought to be made at the time when the pledge was given."

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks :—" The concession was in force for three years. Subsequently it was extended and when the period was extended, the extension was made in favour of combatant men."

Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed :—" I wish to know why such a distinction which was not contained in the pledge was made."

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks :—" The distinction is obvious. The Government thought that combatant people were more deserving than non-combatants."

Proceedings of the recent Collectors' Conference.

*511 Q.—Mr. D. Narayana Raju: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) what is the total cost incurred for the recent Collectors' Conference; and

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table of the House a full report of the proceedings of the conference including the pros and cons discussed and the conclusions arrived at on the several questions taken up for consideration?

A.—(*a*) The cost consisted of the travelling allowances of those officers who attended. The exact figures have not been compiled; approximately the total is about Rs. 2,650.

(*b*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question No. 8 108 put by Mr. Ramachandra Reddi. The proceedings were not reported.

Mr. D. Narayana Raju :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Collectors' Conference was intended merely as a passing show and not considered important enough to make a report of its proceedings?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks :—" That is a matter of opinion, Sir."